arXiv:1611.08160v1 [cond-mat.stat-mech] 24 Nov 2016

The uniform quantized electron gas revisited

Enrique Lomba[1] and Johan S. Høye[2]

[1]*Instituto de Química Física Rocasolano, CSIC,*

Calle Serrano 119, E-28026 Madrid, Spain

[2]*Institutt for Fysikk, NTNU, N-7491 Trondheim, Norway*

(Dated: November 28, 2016)

Abstract

In this work we continue and extend our recent work on the correlation energy of the quantized electron gas of uniform density at temperature $T = 0$. As before we utilize the methods, properties, and results obtained by means of classical statistical mechanics. These were extended to quantized systems via the Feynman path integral formalism. The latter translates the quantum problem into a classical polymer problem in four dimensions. Again the well known RPA (random phase approximation) is recovered as a basic result which we then modify and improve upon. Here we will we focus upon thermodynamic self-consistency. Our numerical calculations exhibit a remarkable agreement with well known results of a standard parametrization of Monte Carlo correlation energies.

I. INTRODUCTION

In a recent work we considered the problem of the correlation energy of the quantized electron gas based upon methods, results, and reasonings of classical statistical mechanics [1]. With this development the well known RPA of quantized system was recovered as a basic result for the correlation energy. As already known, RPA results deviate clearly from available Monte Carlo data [2]. Since the RPA is a basic results also from the viewpoint and methods of liquid state theory for classical fluids, the problem will be how to utilize these methods to improve the RPA in the quantum case. In our previous work we focused upon conditions on the pair correlation function. These must reflect the fact that fermions with equal spins are not allowed to be at the same position. For classical systems the repulsive Coulomb interaction will also prevent particles to be at the same position. These conditions can be applied to the equal time correlation function to improve results. The first condition is exact while the second turns out not to be so in the quantum mechanical case, especially for increasing energy. For this reason, in Ref. [1] the second condition had to be abandoned with some increase of uncertainty in the results.

Our method to improve upon the RPA rests on the introduction of an effective interaction. In the correlation function of the RPA the pair interaction plays a role similar to the direct correlation function for classical systems. It is then known that for a pair of particles at large separation $\mathbf{r}$, the direct correlation function approaches the interaction times inverse temperature with minus sign. For smaller separations there will be deviations. But they should change smoothly for interactions that vary likewise. One then expects the effective interaction to behave in a similar way. With this the fermion condition was used to determine a free parameter in the function describing these deviations. This function may be a Yukawa term (shielded Coulomb) or something related whose range can be determined from the given condition.

In the present work we will focus upon thermodynamic self-consistency. Therefore, the core condition with its uncertainty for unequal spins mentioned above, will not be imposed. Self-consistency in our system has its analog for classical systems in the SCOZA (self-consistent Ornstein-Zernike approximation) and HRT (hierarchical reference theory) for classical systems [3, 4]. They both require thermodynamic self-consistency between compressibility relation and internal energy or the similar type of integral resulting from

change in free energy by a small change in pair interaction. With SCOZA the strength of the effective interaction is tuned by changing the effective temperature, while with HRT the effective interaction is built (and subsequently modified) by gradually including its wave vectors in Fourier space (renormalization). Both SCOZA and HRT turned out to give very accurate results, also in the challenging critical region [4–6].

In the context of the electron gas correlation energy problem, in Ref. [2] the ALDA (adiabatic local density approximation), among other approximations was considered. There the compressibility was used to determine a parameter in an effective interaction. However, in the ALDA formulation, this reduces to the addition of a constant to the Fourier transform of the Coulomb interaction. This constant corresponds to adding a δ-function in $\mathbf{r}$-space. Then the free energy is obtained by integrating the energy-type charging integral. The result obtained clearly over-compensates the inaccuracy of the RPA [2].

The main problem with ALDA, as we see it, lies in its use of the δ-function. A more smooth cut-off of the Coulomb interaction is needed as mentioned above. The adequacy of this assumption was already tested in Ref. [1]. [It may be mentioned that for an interaction of finite range, the SCOZA and HRT simply multiply it with an adjustable constant. This, however, is not suitable for the $1/r$ interaction due to its crucial tail for large $r \to \infty$ that should be kept unmodified. So in this work we will investigate how the use of self-consistency with a smooth cut-off can actually improve the RPA and ALDA results, while retaining the conceptual simplicity of the liquid-state approach explored in Ref. [1].

In Sec. II the compressibility relation for the quantized electron gas will be established. Also explicit expressions for the reference system correlation function (non-interacting Coulomb gas) and its RPA form are written down. It is verified that the reference system correlation function when used in the compressibility relation, reproduces the known equation of state for free fermions. Further for interacting fermions the correction to the reference system equation of state can be expressed via the compressibility relation in terms of a cut-off parameter κ in the resulting effective interaction. This simplifies the situation. The ALDA also evaluates this parameter κ from compressibility based known results. Then by computation of the correlation energy it is found that the inaccuracy of the RPA is over-compensated such that significant improvements of results are not obtained with ALDA [2]. To us this inaccuracy is due to the crude approximation of including a constant in Fourier space or a δ-function in $\mathbf{r}$-space in the effective interaction. To improve upon this situa-

tion we will use κ as a cut-off parameter in smooth effective interactions and then study variations and accuracy of results.

In Sec. III the compressibility with exchange energy only, is considered, and its influence upon the correlation function is written down. It is then found that the exchange energy included alone gives the very simple result $\kappa = \text{const} = 1$.

Then in Sec. IV the influence of the correlation energy is taken into account. Since the correlation energy is a correction to the exchange energy, it turns out that the former has small influence upon the parameter κ; it decreases a small amount. This change will again modify the correlation energy to modify κ a bit further. But this modification will be so small compared with other uncertainties that we simply neglect it. Also the precise relation of consistency between free energy and compressibility can be expressed through a differential equation as in SCOZA and HRT [4, 5]. But with the small change in κ all this can be disregarded, and we have a much simplified consistency problem. With the small influence of the correlation energy upon the κ we can simplify further by just using the correlation energy from fitted simulations to obtain κ.

Thus in Sec. V the "exact" correlation energy, fitted from simulations, is expressed in terms of an analytic expression from which compressibility and thus the parameter κ is easily obtained by differentiation.

In Sec. VI thermodynamic self-consistency between adiabatic charging and compressibility is considered. Then an average value of κ is used in various smooth effective interactions to see the accuracy by which various cutoff functions reproduce the simulation results. From this the correlation function and the wave vector dependence of contributions to the free energy are also obtained. By including another free parameter the exact free energy is relatively easy to recover. Its wave vector dependence, which we also evaluate, is a more strict test on the form of the effective interaction of the uniform electron gas.

Our numerical results for the correlation energy (including its wave vector dependence) are introduced in Sec. VII and compared with the well known Perdew-Wang parameterization [2, 7] of the Ceperley and Alder Monte Carlo results [8]. We will see how a single parameter fit of the correlation energy reproduces its wave vector dependence over the entire range of electron densities. Summary and conclusions are presented in Sec. VIII.

Finally in Sec. IX Appendix it is shown that for the Coulomb gas the quantum mechanical virial theorem is fully consistent with the charging principle.

II. COMPRESSIBILITY RELATION

The compressibility relation is valid for quantized fluids as it is for classical fluids. So, if one considers the free fermion gas, the number of particles is given by Eq. (I15) as ($T \to 0$)

$$\rho = \frac{g}{(2\pi)^3}\int \frac{\zeta X}{1+\zeta X}\, d\mathbf{k} \to \frac{g}{(2\pi)^3}\int_{k<k_f} d\mathbf{k} = \frac{4\pi g}{3(2\pi)^3}k_f^3. \tag{1}$$

Here and below the numeral I will be used to designate equations of Ref. [1]. In Eq. (1) the $g = 2$ is the spin degeneracy of electrons, $\zeta = e^{\beta\mu}$ where μ is the chemical potential, and $\beta = 1/(k_B T)$ where k_B is Boltzmann's constant and T is temperature. Further

$$X = F_\beta(k), \quad F_\lambda(k) = \exp\left(-\lambda E(k)\right), \quad \text{and} \quad E(k) = \frac{1}{2m}(\hbar k)^2 \tag{2}$$

where m is particle mass and k is wave vector.

For the free fermion gas at $T = 0$ the $\mu = \mu_f = (\hbar k_f)^2/2m$ where k_f is the Fermi wave-vector. By differentiation of Eq. (1) one finds

$$\frac{\partial\rho}{\partial(\beta\mu)} = \frac{g}{(2\pi)^3}\int \frac{\zeta X}{(1+\zeta X)^2}\, d\mathbf{k} = g\tilde{S}(0,0) = \frac{g}{\beta}\hat{S}(0,0) \tag{3}$$

where $\tilde{S}(\lambda, k)$ and $\hat{S}(K, k)$ are given by Eqs. (I1) and (I4).

$$\tilde{S}(\lambda, k) = \frac{\zeta}{(2\pi)^3}\int \frac{\tilde{F}_\lambda(k')\tilde{F}_{\beta-\lambda}(k'')}{(1\pm\zeta X)(1\pm\zeta Y)}\, d\mathbf{k}' \tag{4}$$

where $\mathbf{k}'' = \mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}'$ and $\lambda = it/\hbar$ (t is time), $0 < \lambda < \beta$, and

$$\hat{S}(K, k) = \frac{\zeta}{(2\pi)^3}\int \frac{1}{iK+\Delta}\frac{X-Y}{(1\pm\zeta X)(1\pm\zeta Y)}\, d\mathbf{k}' \tag{5}$$

here with $X = F_\beta(k')$, $Y = F_\beta(k'')$, and $\Delta = E(k'') - E(k')$, the plus and minus signs denoting fermions and bosons respectively. The $S(\lambda, r)$ is the pair correlation function (including self-correlation of a single particle) in space and imaginary time λ ($0 < \lambda < \beta$). The tilde denotes Fourier transform in space with variable $\mathbf{k}$ while the hat also includes Fourier transform in imaginary time with variable K. Then $K = 2\pi n/\beta$ with n integer are also the same as the well known Matsubara frequencies. With Eqs. (I10) - (I12) one has explicitly [2]

$$g\hat{S}(K, k) = \frac{mk_f}{2\pi^2\hbar^2}f(Q, x) \tag{6}$$

$$\begin{aligned} f(Q,x) \;=\; -\Bigg[&\frac{Q^2-x^2-1}{4Q}\ln\left(\frac{x^2+(Q+1)^2}{x^2+(Q-1)^2}\right) \\ &-1 + x\arctan\left(\frac{1+Q}{x}\right) + x\arctan\left(\frac{1-Q}{x}\right)\Bigg] \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

with

$$x = \frac{mK}{\hbar^2 k k_f} = \frac{K}{4\mu_f Q}, \quad \mu_f = \frac{(\hbar k_f)^2}{2m}, \quad Q = \frac{k}{2k_f}. \tag{8}$$

The β can be removed from Eq. (3) to obtain for its inverse

$$\frac{\partial \mu}{\partial \rho} = \frac{1}{g\hat{S}(0,0)}. \tag{9}$$

For interacting systems the $\hat{S}(K,k)$ is to be replaced by the resulting correlation function $\hat{\Gamma}(K,k)$. In our case it has the RPA form (I25)

$$g\hat{\Gamma}(K,k) = \frac{g\hat{S}(K,k)}{1+\hat{A}(K)}, \tag{10}$$

$$\hat{A}(K) = \hat{A}_e(K) = -g\hat{S}(K,k)(-\tilde{\psi}(k)) = D\frac{f(Q,x)}{Q^2}, \tag{11}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\psi}(k) &= \frac{e^2}{\varepsilon_0 k^2}, \quad \frac{4\pi}{3}(r_s a_0)^3 = \frac{1}{\rho}, \quad a_0 = \frac{4\pi\varepsilon_0\hbar^2}{me^2}, \\ D &= \frac{mk_f}{2\pi^2\hbar^2}\frac{e^2}{\varepsilon_0(2k_f)^2} = 0.082293 \cdot r_s \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

as given by Eqs. (I5), (I9), (I13), (I16), and (I17). The $\tilde{\psi}(k)$ is the Fourier transform of the Coulomb interaction, a_0 is the Bohr radius, $-e$ is the electron charge, and ε_0 is the vacuum permitivity.

Now the interaction can be replaced by the effective interaction (I26)

$$\tilde{\psi}_e(k) = \tilde{\psi}(k)L(Q), \quad L(0) = 1 \tag{13}$$

by which

$$\hat{A}(K) = \hat{A}_e(K) = -g\hat{S}(K,k)(-\tilde{\psi}_e(k)), \tag{14}$$

and relation (9) with $\hat{S}$ replaced by $\hat{\Gamma}$ turns into

$$\frac{\partial \mu}{\partial \rho} = \frac{1}{g\hat{\Gamma}(0,0)} = \frac{1}{g\hat{S}(0,0)} + \tilde{\psi}_e(0). \tag{15}$$

Now the $\tilde{\psi}_e(k)$ like the $\tilde{\psi}(k)$ diverges when the $k \to 0$. However, the electron gas is neutralized by a neutralizing background that cancels the mean field term $\tilde{\psi}(0)$ (small charges $\to 0$ of high density $\to \infty$). Thus with pressure p we end up with the compressibility relation ($Q \to 0$)

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\rho}\frac{\partial p}{\partial \rho} &= \frac{\partial \mu}{\partial \rho} = \frac{1}{g\hat{S}(0,0)} + (\tilde{\psi}_e(Q) - \tilde{\psi}(Q)) \\ &= \frac{1}{g\hat{S}(0,0)} + (L(Q)-1)\tilde{\psi}(Q) = \frac{2\pi^2\hbar^2}{mk_f f(0,0)} - \frac{1}{\kappa^2}\frac{e^2}{\varepsilon_0(2k_f)^2} \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

with $f(Q,x)$ and $\tilde{\psi}(k)$ given by Eqs. (7) and (12) respectively. For small Q we have used the expansion

$$L(Q) = 1 - \frac{Q^2}{\kappa^2}. \tag{17}$$

Thus compressibility determines the coefficient κ.

III. COMPRESSIBILITY WITH EXCHANGE ENERGY

The chemical potential of the free electron gas is the well known ($T = 0$)

$$\mu_0 = \mu_f = \frac{(\hbar k_f)^2}{2m} \sim k_f^2 \sim \rho^{2/3} \tag{18}$$

with ρ given by (1). Helmholtz free energy per unit volume is then

$$F_0 = \frac{3}{5}\rho\mu_f \sim \rho^{5/3} \tag{19}$$

since $\mu_0 = \partial F_0/\partial\rho$. This gives the inverse compressibility (divided by ρ)

$$\frac{\partial\mu_0}{\partial\rho} = \frac{\partial^2 F_0}{\partial\rho^2} = \frac{2\mu_f}{3\rho} = \frac{\pi^2\hbar^2}{mk_f}. \tag{20}$$

This is precisely the first term of relation (16) as should be expected noting that from expression (7) the $f(0,0) = 2$.

The exchange energy per unit volume F_{ex} is given by Eqs. (9.5) and (9.9) of Ref. [9] as

$$F_{ex} = \frac{g}{2(2\pi)^3}\int \tilde{S}(0,k)\tilde{\psi}(k)\, d\mathbf{k} = -\frac{3\pi e^2 k_f}{2(2\pi)^3\varepsilon_0}\rho \sim \rho^{4/3}. \tag{21}$$

The contribution to the inverse compressibility thus becomes

$$\frac{\partial^2 F_{ex}}{\partial\rho^2} = \frac{1}{3}\cdot\frac{4}{3}\cdot\frac{F_{ex}}{\rho^2} = -\frac{e^2}{\varepsilon_0(2k_f)^2}. \tag{22}$$

When comparing with the last term of Eq. (16) one finds that the exchange energy alone means that $\kappa = 1$.

The exchange energy is the dominating contribution to the interaction energy at high density. Thus $\kappa = 1$ is the high density value while for finite densities there will be higher order corrections to this value. Altogether we will find that κ has small variations consistent with numerical results obtained in Ref. [1].

IV. USE OF "EXACT" CORRELATION ENERGY

For the electron gas of uniform density accurate results for the correlation energy have been obtained from simulations [8]. Thus these results which may be considered exact, can be utilized to obtain values for the parameter κ in a rather straightforward way. For general use it is preferable to express the correlation Helmholtz energy per particle f_c as

$$f_c = \mu_f G(r_s). \tag{23}$$

Inserting numerical values with use of Eqs. (1), (12), and (18) one finds Eq. (I20) for the Fermi energy

$$\mu_f = \frac{50.1\,\mathrm{eV}}{r_s^2}. \tag{24}$$

We will need first and second derivatives of $G(r_s)$, so it will be advantageous to fit it with an analytic expression. Here it should be noted that if the Coulomb interaction is scaled with a parameter λ ($0 \le \lambda \le 1$), i.e. $e^2 \to \lambda e^2$, the function $G(r_s)$ will scale to become $G(x)$ with $x = \lambda r_s$ while expression (24) for μ_f is unchanged. This is the charging principle which we will consider [2]. [Note, here the parameter λ is not the imaginary time of Eqs. (2) and (4).] The scaling property, consistent with one free parameter for the electron gas, can be seen by considering the Schrödinger equation for a particle in the Coulomb potential or its extension to more particles with Coulomb interactions.

With correlation energy $F_c = \rho f_c$ per unit volume we now with expressions (23) and (24) find for its contributions to the chemical potential and inverse compressibility ($r_s \sim 1/\rho^{1/3}$)

$$\mu_c = \frac{\partial F_c}{\partial \rho} = \frac{\mu_f}{3}(5G - xG') \tag{25}$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 F_c}{\partial \rho^2} = \frac{\mu_f}{9\rho}(10G - 6xG' + x^2 G'') \tag{26}$$

where $G = G(x)$ and G' and G'' are its derivatives with respect to $x = \lambda r_s$. Here the charging parameter λ (not present in μ_f) has been included.

Expression (26) can be directly related to expression (16) to determine the parameter κ. With use of Eqs. (1), (8), (12), and (20) expression (16) can be rewritten in the convenient form ($f(0,0) = 2$)

$$\frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial \rho^2} = \frac{\partial \mu}{\partial \rho} = \frac{\mu_f}{\rho}\left(\frac{2}{3} - \frac{1}{\kappa^2}\frac{4Dx}{3r_s}\right) \tag{27}$$

where the parameter λ also is included with $x = \lambda r_s$. The F is the total free energy per unit volume. As already concluded, the exchange energy alone results in $\kappa = 1$. Thus for the correlation energy one is left with

$$\frac{\partial^2 F_c}{\partial \rho^2} = -\frac{\mu_f}{\rho} H(x), \quad H(x) = \frac{4}{3}\left(\frac{1}{\kappa^2} - 1\right)\frac{Dx}{r_s}. \tag{28}$$

So we find

$$\frac{1}{\kappa^2} = 1 + \frac{3r_s}{4D}\frac{H(x)}{x} \quad \left(\frac{D}{r_s} = 0.082293\right) \tag{29}$$

where with Eqs. (26) and (28)

$$H(x) = -\frac{1}{9}\left(10G - 6xG' + x^2 G''\right). \tag{30}$$

V. ANALYTIC EXPRESSION FOR EXACT CORRELATION ENERGY

In the high density limit, $k_f \to \infty$ or $r_s \to 0$, the exact correlation energy is known to have the form $f_c \sim \ln r_s + \text{const}$. Inserted in Eqs. (23) and (24) this means

$$G(x) = ax^2 \ln x + b \tag{31}$$

where a and b are constants. Here $x = \lambda r_s$ (with $\lambda = 1$). For $r_s \to 0$ one finds a good fit to the PW parameterization with $a = 0.016$, and $b = -0.0293$. This is near the exact limiting result [10] ($f_c = -13.6\,\text{eV} \cdot 0.0622 \cdot \ln(a_0 k_f) + \text{const.} = -0.846\,\text{eV} \cdot \ln(a_0 k_f) + \text{const.}$), which gives $a = 0.0169$. In a general situation, one will find that (31) with a decaying coefficient $a = a(x)$ will fit the energy well (for $r_s < 10$). Thus a may be replaced by the function

$$a(x) = a' + a_1\left(\frac{1}{1 + \alpha_1 x}\right) + a_2(e^{-\alpha_2 x} - 1) \tag{32}$$

where the coefficients a', b, a_1, α_1, a_2, and α_2 are to be determined. Here we have chosen to fit the coefficients to reproduce the PW correlation energy over the range $r_s = 0.001$ to $r_s = 10$, which gives $a' = 0.0086$, $b = -0.0324$, $a_1 = 0.0134$, $\alpha_1 = 1.002$, $a_2 = -0.0067$, and $\alpha_2 = 0.843$. With this expression derivatives of the resulting $G(x) = a(x)\,x^2(\ln x + b)$ are obtained in a straightforward way, and one can determine the dependence of κ on x (or r_s) from Eq. (29).

Also, using expression (31) the small x behavior of the coefficient κ of the cutoff function (17) is easily obtained. Thus by differentiation and insertion into Eqs. (29) and (30) with

$a = 0.016$ (from the $r_s \to 0$ fit) one finds

$$\frac{1}{\kappa^2} \approx 1 + \frac{3r_s}{4D}\frac{a}{3}x = 1 + 3.04ax = 1 + 0.048x \tag{33}$$

$$\kappa \approx 1 - 0.024x. \tag{34}$$

In Fig. 1 we present the variation of κ as a function of x, and in the inset the high density linear limit (34) is illustrated. Thus κ varies little and stays near 1 (for $\lambda r_s = x < 10$). Due to this small variation, we in our numerical work as a great simplification have assumed κ constant, keeping an average value ($\kappa = 0.96$) when evaluating the correlation energy.

VI. THERMODYNAMIC SELF-CONSISTENCY

In Ref. [1] we used the RPA type free energy with effective interaction. It was inspired by the MSA (mean spherical approximation) free energy for classical hard spheres with perturbing interaction outside. In Ref. [2] its Eq. (23), the adiabatic approximation, is used along with the compressibility given by its Eq. (31) to obtain the ALDA (adiabatic local-density approximation). But there the use of the compressibility only adds a constant to the Fourier transform of the interaction $\tilde{\psi}(k)$ to obtain the effective interaction, $\tilde{\psi}_e(k) = \tilde{\psi}(k)L(Q)$, with $L(Q)$ given by Eq. (17) for all Q. This means that the added piece is merely a δ-function in $\mathbf{r}$-space. Compared with results for classical fluids and the "classical polymer problem" formed by the quantized electron gas, this is clearly inaccurate. As argued in Ref. [1], the Coulomb interaction should be cut by a smooth function to obtain the effective one where we will assume $L(Q) \to 0$ as $Q \to \infty$.

Based on the exact free energy the ALDA curve for $r_s = 4$ is obtained in Fig. 2 of Ref. [2]. [This figure gives the Q-dependent contributions $\varepsilon_c(Q)$ to the correlation energy according to expressions (35) and (50) below.] There accurate results are obtained for $Q < 0.7$, but they become rather inaccurate for larger values of Q. Clearly this is related to the wrong large Q-behavior of $L(Q)$. We can now impose thermodynamic self-consistency using a smooth cut-off function with a free (or an extra free) parameter to be determined. In this way the equation of state is required to be the same both via the free energy expression and the compressibility. This, as mentioned earlier, corresponds to the SCOZA and HRT methods used for classical fluids to obtain very accurate results near the critical region[4, 5]. These approaches lead to partial differential equations that are highly non-trivial to solve

numerically. For the electron gas, however, the two variables of interest enter both through the scaling variable $x = \lambda r_s$; so it all simplifies. However, as mentioned in Sec. I we can simplify further. Thus we will utilize the known exact solution. Also the parameter $\kappa = \kappa(x)$ may be considered constant with respect to λ, since as we have seen, it changes little with electron density. This leads to a further simplification.

The adiabatic charging principle, Eq. (23) of Ref. [2], gives the change to the Helmholtz free energy by a small change in the perturbing potential. We first consider the RPA with correlation energy (I18) and (I19) modified by the charging parameter λ.

$$f_c = \frac{\Delta F_c}{\rho} = 12 \int_0^\infty \tilde{f}_c(k) Q^2 \, dQ \tag{35}$$

$$\tilde{f}_c(k) = \frac{1}{\pi} \mu Q \int [\ln(1 + \lambda \hat{A}(K)) - \lambda \hat{A}(K)] \, dx \tag{36}$$

with $\hat{A}(K)$ given by Eq. (11). From this we find

$$u_c(k) = \lambda \frac{\partial \tilde{f}_c(k)}{\partial \lambda} = \frac{1}{\pi} \mu Q \int \left[\frac{\lambda \hat{A}(K)}{1 + \lambda \hat{A}(K)} - \lambda \hat{A}(K) \right] dx \tag{37}$$

In terms of the correlation function this can be written as

$$u_c(k) = \frac{1}{\pi} \mu Q \int g[\hat{\Gamma}(K,k) - \hat{S}(K,k)] \lambda \psi(k) \, dx. \tag{38}$$

Now this equation is not tied to the RPA, but is valid more generally. So the problem left is to have a best possible approximation to the resulting correlation function. Then again we keep the MSA form (I38) (with $\hat{\Gamma}_+ \to \hat{\Gamma}$, $\hat{A}_+ \to \hat{A}_e$) or Eq. (10) with $\hat{A} \to \lambda A_e$

$$\hat{\Gamma}(K,k) = \frac{\hat{S}(K,k)}{1 + \lambda \hat{A}_e(K)} \tag{39}$$

where with effective interaction $\tilde{\psi}_e(k) = \tilde{\psi}(k) L(Q)$

$$\hat{A}_e(K) = \hat{A}(K) L(Q) \tag{40}$$

with $\hat{A}(K)$ given by Eq. (11). It can be noted that with expression (38) only the $\hat{\Gamma}_+ \to \hat{\Gamma}$ part contributes since $\tilde{\psi}(k)$ at the end of Eq. (38) is the un-cut interaction. In Ref. [1] a $\hat{\Gamma}_-$ part was also present, but now it will not contribute in (38) since the un-cut interaction there at the end of the equation does not distinguish between pairs of equal and unequal spins.

From the results of Ref. [1] it was found that exact results were well approximated with κ constant. This is consistent with the small x result (34). With this approximation expression (38) is easily integrated to obtain

$$\tilde{f}_c(k) = \frac{\mu Q}{\pi L(Q)} \int [\ln(1 + \lambda \hat{A}_e(K)) - \lambda \hat{A}_e(K)]\, dx \tag{41}$$

This simplifies considerably as numerical integration of (38) is avoided. Then an average value of $\kappa = \kappa(x)$ in the interval $0 < x < r_s$ may be used. We have extended the approximation further by keeping κ constant in the whole interval $0 < r_s < 10$. Thus the ALDA curve of Fig. 2 in Ref. [2] is recovered from expressions (17) and (41) with $\kappa \approx 0.96$. Note this curve changes sign at $Q = \kappa$. The reason is that for small $L(Q)$ the integrand of (41) is proportional to $L(Q)^2$.

One way to utilize result (41) is to use smooth cutoff functions like the ones used in Ref. [1] or something similar from which to evaluate the free energy that follows from expression (41) with $\lambda = 1$. The average κ to be used, with $L(Q)$ expanded like Eq. (17)), follows from Eq. (29). The resulting free energy will deviate somewhat from the exact one, but usually much less than the ALDA one, depending upon the $L(Q)$ chosen. Also the result may be used to obtain an iterated value for κ to make it self-consistent. But the change will be small anyway, and has been neglected here.

Next one can search for a smooth cut-off function $L(Q)$ that reproduces the exact result for the correlation energy F_c. This can be done by combining two functions $L_1(Q)$ and $L_2(Q)$ with an additional free parameter α

$$L(Q) = \alpha L_1(Q) + (1 - \alpha) L_2(Q) \tag{42}$$

with κ as before. Then self-consistency is imposed by requiring that via Eqs. (37)-(40) integral (35) for the free energy is the exact one. Remaining inaccuracy then lies in the curve for the function $f_c(k)$ where deviations of one sign are compensated by those of opposite sign. Further the $L_2(Q)$ can be made as an additional combination of functions with free parameters as in Eq. (48) below to minimize the inaccuracy of $\tilde{f}_c(k)$.

It should again be noted that the self-consistency problem discussed above is the analog of the SCOZA and HRT that both have resulted in very accurate results for classical fluids. They both have the internal energy type integral (38) that computes the response to a change in interaction, i.e. change in inverse temperature β and change in wave vector Q respectively.

Free energy then follows by integration, and it is forced to be consistent with compressibility. This gives rise to a non-linear partial differential equation. In the present case, however, the situation simplifies much due to the scaling form (23) by which derivatives with respect to λ and ρ are essentially the same as they join in the scaling variable $x = \lambda r_s$. The detailed differential equation of thermodynamic self-consistency is then obtained by equating the $\partial^2(\lambda\partial F_c/\partial\lambda)/\partial\rho^2$ that follows from Eqs. (35) - (38) with the $\lambda\partial(\partial^2 F_c/\partial\rho^2)/\partial\lambda$ that follows from (28). But in view of the discussion and simplifications made above resulting in Eq. (41) and use of available exact energy, we find no reason to go further in this direction.

VII. RESULTS

Along the same lines of Ref. [1], here we utilize Eqs. (35), (40) and (41) with a series of cutoff functions which are enumerated below,

$$L_{ALDA}(Q) = 1 - Q^2/\kappa^2 \tag{43}$$

$$L_{se}(Q) = \frac{\kappa^2}{Q^2+\kappa^2}, \tag{44}$$

$$L_{exp}(Q) = \left(\frac{\kappa^2}{Q^2+\kappa^2}\right)^2, \tag{45}$$

$$L_{erf}(Q) = \exp\left(-Q^2/(2\kappa)^2\right), \tag{46}$$

$$L_{gauss}(Q) = 1 - Q^2\left(\left[\frac{3}{2} - \frac{Q^2}{4\kappa^2}\right]\frac{D_+(Q/(2\kappa))}{\kappa Q} + \frac{1}{4\kappa^2}\right), \tag{47}$$

with $D_+(x)$ being Dawson's integral [1, 11]. As mentioned, the parameter κ will be kept fixed and equal to 0.96 for all calculations. Thus with these cutoffs the resulting free energies are found and compared with the PW parameterization [7] in Fig. 2. Additionally, the cutoff function (42) is implemented by fitting the α parameter in this equation so that f_c agrees with the PW parameterization. After various trials, we have found that an optimum fit is obtained with, $L_1(Q) = L_{gauss}(Q,\kappa)$ and

$$L_2(Q) = L_{exp}(Q,\xi\kappa) - L_{erf}(Q,\xi\kappa) - \alpha'\left(L_{exp}(Q,\xi'\kappa) - L_{erf}(Q,\xi'\kappa)\right) \tag{48}$$

which combines two possible different ranges in Q. The procedure is then the following, with a given set of initial parameters we use a Marquardt-Levenberg residual minimization algorithm to fit $f_c(Q)$ and f_c to the PW value, for $r_s = 4$, obtaining a set of $(\alpha, \xi, \xi', \alpha')$ parameters. Then, for different values of r_s only the value of α' is adjusted to match the

integrated correlation energy f_c. In the lower graph of figure 2 we represent the deviations of the correlation energy with respect to the PW parameterization, for the fitted case (which obviously agrees completely by its construction), for the ALDA, and for results from Eq. (41) using the various smooth cuts (44) - (47) for the function $L(Q)$, with $\kappa = 0.96$ fixed. As found in Ref. [1], the Gaussian cut (47) performs substantially better than other cuts, clearly outperforming both the RPA and the ALDA approximation. Note the ALDA curve deviates a bit from the one of Fig. 5 of Ref. [1] which was further taken from Ref. [2]. This deviation we attribute to our very simplified $\kappa = \text{const}$ integration with respect to λ which leads to expression (41).

We can now check to what extent the average core condition on the correlation function behaves due to the approximations we have made. In Ref. [1] it was used as a condition. However, it was realized that particles with unequal spins and with Coulomb repulsion could, depending upon the particle density, be on the same position. Thus only a crude estimate or guess of the core condition was made. From Eq. (57) of Ref. [1], the average contribution to the core condition on the correlation function (10) for equal and unequal spin pairs can be written

$$F_{cc}(r_s) = \frac{36}{\pi} \int \int \frac{D f^2(Q,x) L(Q,\kappa)}{Q^2 + D f(Q,x) L(Q,\kappa)} dx\, Q^3\, dQ. \tag{49}$$

Thus, F_{cc} does not contain the contribution from the reference system $\hat{S}(K,k)$. Furthermore it is here normalized such that it will be equal to 1, instead of -1, when pairs of unequal spins cannot overlap, and is equal to 0 when they can overlap fully. The function F_{cc} is plotted in the upper graph of Fig. 2 for the same range of electron densities. Here one observes a reasonable behavior by all approximations except for ALDA that goes rapidly negative. But they all approach 0 when $r_s \to 0$ (high density and high energy limit). However, for r_s large (low density) 3 of the curves cross the hard core line located at 1. [If the exact curve had been known, another parameter could have been fitted.]

Finally, in Figure 3 we plot the wave vector decomposition of the correlation energy for various values of r_s and compare it with those of the PW parameterization. Then the $L(Q)$ of Eq. (42) together with expression (48) is used. As it is customary we represent the function,

$$\varepsilon_c(Q) = 12 Q^2 \tilde{f}_c(Q) \tag{50}$$

which can be directly integrated over Q to yield the correlation energy f_c. The results for

$r_s = 4$ obviously match those of the parameterization best –this is the fitted value for all 4 parameters mentioned above–, but small departures are visible for low and high electron densities. Recall that aside from the case $r_s = 4$ only a single parameter is fitted to the integrated correlation energy. The curves tend to overestimate slightly the long wave vector contribution to the correlation, which is compensated by an underestimation at small k.

VIII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

We have evaluated the correlation energy for the uniform quantized fermion gas of electrons, extending our recent work[1]. In Ref. 1 the core condition, which implies that fermions with equal spins can not be at the same position, played a central role in our approximation. However, with quantum mechanics particles with opposite spins have the possibility to be at the same position also with Coulomb repulsion. Thus the average core condition became somewhat undetermined. The basis for the computations were the RPA, but with a smooth cut of the Coulomb interaction for small distances. For the free energy an expression inspired by the MSA of classical fluids was used. Compared with simulation data, good results were obtained for certain cutoff functions while others led to divergence problems.

Inspired by the ALDA of Ref. [2] we in this work have focused upon the compressibility relation and thermodynamic self-consistency as used in the SCOZA and HRT for classical fluids [3–6]. This determines a parameter κ in the effective interaction. In addition, we make use of the fact that the effective (cut) interaction behaves as a smooth function. The range of the cut is the inverse of κ. With reasonable cutoff functions, results for the correlation energy substantially improve. Also with Eqs. (42) and (48) one has a cut with additional free parameters to reproduce the exact correlation energy. Finally, as a more sensitive test of our approach for the free energy, in Fig. 3 we present its wave vector decomposition. Also for this more detailed analysis we find a good agreement with the simulation results, which again reflects the proper form of the effective (cut) interaction used.

Our results may be extended to the non-uniform electron gas of molecules. The basis for the correlation energy will still be the RPA extended to this more general situation. Numerical evaluations will clearly be much more demanding as translational symmetry is lost. The reference system correlation function is now determined by the eigenstates, including the excited ones, that follows from the DFT (density functional theory) or Hartree-Fock so-

lution of the problem considered from which the standard RPA established. Then the RPA is modified such that the full Coulomb interaction is replaced by a cut one consistent with or similar to the one obtained for the uniform case studied in this work. A crucial result of our work is that the cut function $L(Q)$ is a smooth one that has small or negligible variation with changing electron density. But there will be some complication as clear density dependence sits in the shift of variable $k = 2k_f\kappa Q$ ($k_f \sim \rho^{1/3}$). Further in the non-uniform case one needs the effective interaction in $\mathbf{r}$ space, $\psi_e(r) = \psi(r)f(r)$ ($\psi(r) \sim 1/r$). So with cuts (44) - (47) one has $f(r) = H(x)$ with $x = 2k_f\kappa r$ where $H(x)$ is given by Eq. (48) of Ref. [1]. Since $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{r}_2 - \mathbf{r}_1$ the k_f ($\sim \rho^{1/3}$) to choose to determine κ will not be obvious. As a compromise, some average density for positions 1 and 2 can be used. Further investigations will need numerical ab initio calculations on non-uniform system with basis on the RPA, and are beyond the scope of this work.

Acknowledgments

EL acknowledges the support from the Dirección General de Investigación Científica y Técnica under Grant No. FIS2013-47350-C5-4-R.

IX. APPENDIX: VIRIAL THEOREM

Quantized systems also fulfill the virial theorem. For the quantized electron gas we will show that it is fully consistent with the adiabatic approximation. On the other hand this consistency means that there will be no extra condition to determine some extra parameter. The virial theorem is

$$p = \frac{2}{3}\rho u_k - \frac{1}{6}\int d\mathbf{r}\, \mathbf{r}\nabla\psi(r)n(r) \tag{51}$$

where p is pressure, u_k is kinetic energy per particle, and $n(r)$ is the pair distribution function. This theorem is also valid for quantized systems. [For hard core particles one has to take the proper limit of the integral. This limit is different in the classical and quantum cases.] For an ionic fluid that is neutralized by an oppositely charged background the $n(r)$ is replaced by $\rho^2 h(r)$ where $h(r)$ is the pair correlation function.

With Coulomb interaction $\psi \propto 1/r$ by which

$$\mathbf{r}\nabla\psi(r) = r\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\psi(r) = -\psi(r). \tag{52}$$

The integral in Eq. (51) can also be written as a Fourier integral. Then $\mathbf{r}\nabla\psi(r) \rightarrow -\nabla(\mathbf{k}\tilde{\psi}(k))$. So with $\tilde{\psi}(k) \propto 1/k^2$

$$\nabla(\mathbf{k}\tilde{\psi}(k)) = \frac{\partial}{\partial k_i}\left(k_i\tilde{\psi}(k)\right) = \tilde{\psi}(k) \tag{53}$$

which is equivalent to to Eq. (52) ($k_i k_i = k^2$, $\sum_i$, $i = 1, 2, 3$). So with Fourier transform and use of Eq. (53) for Coulomb interaction the virial theorem becomes

$$p = \frac{2}{3}\rho u_k + \frac{1}{3}\rho u_p \tag{54}$$

$$\rho u_p = \frac{1}{2(2\pi)^3}\int d\mathbf{k}\,\rho^2\tilde{h}(k)\tilde{\psi}(k). \tag{55}$$

where u_p is the potential energy per particle for the neutral ionic fluid. Now the total energy per particle is the same as the internal energy $u = u_k + u_p$. With this $u_k = u - u_p$ by which

$$p = \frac{2}{3}\rho u - \frac{1}{3}\rho u_p. \tag{56}$$

At $T = 0$ the free energy per particle f is the same as the internal energy u since entropy is zero (or finite) for quantized systems in their ground states. For the quantized reference system the correlation function is (equal time correlations $\lambda = 0$)

$$\rho^2\tilde{h}_{ex}(k) = g\tilde{S}(0,k) - \rho. \tag{57}$$

This leads to the exchange energy while the remaining part of the correlation function is the one that leads to the correlation energy

$$\rho^2\tilde{h}_c(k) = g\tilde{\Gamma}(0,k) - g\tilde{S}(0,k)). \tag{58}$$

With Eqs. (37) and (38) for $u_c(k)$ which along with Eq. (55) leads to $u_p = \lambda(\partial f/\partial\lambda)$, one altogether finds

$$p = \frac{2}{3}\rho f - \frac{1}{3}\rho\lambda\frac{\partial f}{\partial\lambda}. \tag{59}$$

To see this more clearly the free energy can be split in three contributions

$$f = f_0 + f_{ex} + f_c \tag{60}$$

where for the reference system contribution, $\partial f_0/\partial\lambda$=0. For the exchange and correlation energies one with Eqs. (57) and(58) has

$$\rho\lambda\frac{\partial f_{ex}}{\partial\lambda} = \frac{1}{2(2\pi)^3}\int d\mathbf{k}\,(g\tilde{S}(0,k) - \rho)\lambda\tilde{\psi}(k) \tag{61}$$

$$\rho\lambda\frac{\partial f_c}{\partial\lambda} = \frac{1}{2(2\pi)^3}\frac{1}{2\pi}\int dK \int d\mathbf{k}\, g(\hat{\Gamma}(K,k) - \hat{S}(K,k))\lambda\tilde{\psi}(k). \tag{62}$$

(Eq. (62) with variables of integration K and $\mathbf{k}$ is the same as Eqs. (35) - (39).) What remains is to show that the pressure (59) also follows from the standard free energy route by differentiation with respect to density. One has the thermodynamic relation

$$p = \rho^2\frac{\partial f}{\partial\rho}. \tag{63}$$

To show this we utilize the scaling form Eqs. (23) and (24) for f_c which also is valid for the whole free energy at $T = 0$. With $\mu_f \sim 1/r_s^2 \sim \rho^{2/3}$ and $r_s \to \lambda r_s \sim \lambda/\rho^{1/3}$ we can write

$$f = \rho^{2/3}F(x), \quad x = \frac{\lambda}{\rho^{1/3}}. \tag{64}$$

Thus

$$\rho\frac{\partial f}{\partial\rho} = \frac{2}{3}\rho^{2/3}F(x) + \rho^{2/3}F'(x)\left(-\frac{1}{3}x\right) = \frac{2}{3}f - \frac{1}{3}\lambda\frac{\partial f}{\partial\lambda} \tag{65}$$

which inserted in Eq. (63) is the same as expression (59). Thus result (59) from the virial theorem is same as the one from the free energy route.

---

[1] J.S. Høye and E. Lomba, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter **28**, 414001 (2016).

[2] M. Lein, E.K.U. Gross, and J.P. Perdew, Phys. Rev. B **61**, 13431 (2000).

[3] J.S. Høye and G. Stell, J. Chem. Phys. **67**, 439-445 (1977).

[4] A. Parola and L. Reatto, Mol. Phys. **110**, 2859 (2012).

[5] D. Pini, J.S. Høye, and G. Stell, Physica, **397**, 469 (2002).

[6] J.S. Høye and E. Lomba, Mol. Phys. **109**, 2773 (2011); E. Lomba and J.S. Høye, Mol. Phys. **112**, 2892 (2014).

[7] J. P. Perdew, Y. Wang, Phys. Rev. B, **45**, 13244 (1992); ibidem, **46**, 12947 (1992)

[8] D. M. Ceperley, Phys. Rev. B **18**, 3126 (1978); D. M. Ceperley and B.J. Alder, Phys. Rev. Lett. **45**, 566 (1980).

[9] J.S. Høye, J. Chem. Phys. **135**, 134102 (2011).

[10] S. H. Vosko, L. Wilk, and M. Nusair, Can. J. Phys. **58**, 1200 (1980); M. Gell-Mann and K. A. Brueckner, Phys. Rev. **106**, 364 (1957); B.S. Shastry, Phys. Rev. B **17**, 385 (1978); J. P. Perdew and A. Zunger, Phys. Rev. B **23**, 5048 (1981).

[11] M. Abramowitz and I.A. Stegun, *Handbook of Mathematical Functions* (Dover, New York, 1972).



FIG. 1: Dependence of the κ parameter – see Eqs.(16) and (29) – on the r_s. The inset illustrates the high electron density regime, with the dash-dotted line corresponding to the asymptotic behavior given by Eq.(34).



FIG. 2: Computation of the core condition integral Eq. (49) for various cuts (top graph). The electron correlation energy with respect to the Perdew-Wang parameterization[7] (bottom graph) is computed with the various cuts indicated by the equation numbers and in the ALDA [2]).



FIG. 3: Wave vector analysis of the correlation energy per electron, calculated using the optimized cut given by Eqs. (42) and (51) for the effective interaction and then compared with the Perdew-Wang parameterization [2, 7] computed for various values of r_s.